APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,156	10/04/2005	Tasuku Amemiya	Q85728	9035

23373   7590   05/22/2008

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER
KIM, KEVIN Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3714	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/22/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 January 2008</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>13 January 2005</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-12 are pending as of the amendment received 1/28/2008. Claims 1, 5-

7 and 12 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Postrel (US 6,594,640 B1) in view of Martinez et al (US 6,119,229).

4.   In re claim 1, Postrel discloses a network service system for providing a user with

first and second services, said services comprising activities which allow the user to

earn points by using the service (column 5, lines 3-16, the user earns points by

participating in activities that earn points, e.g. purchasing merchandise), comprising:

        a first server (figure 4, 20) for providing the first service directly to a user (column

6, lines 5-11);

        a first database (figure 4, 54) connected to the first server for storing point

information in association with user identifying information related to the user in the first

server (column 7, lines 14-19 and figure 5, 54, "user accounts," "user preferences,"

etc.). As disclosed, database 54 stores the user's reward exchange account, and

transfer of points into said account is possible (column 7, lines 21-23).

a second server (figure 4, 10, 12, or 14) for providing the second service (column 5, lines 39-43); and

a second database connected to the second server (figure 4, 52 and column 6, lines 17-20) for storing point information in association with user identifying information related to the user in the second service (column 5, lines 39-43); wherein

the first server includes point offering means for updating the point information stored in the first database in association with the user identifying information related to the user so as to offer points to the user (column 6, lines 47-50). This limitation meets the three-prong test per MPEP 2181 and thereby invokes 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph. The point offering means of Postrel are considered an equivalent to applicant's means (page 18, lines 19-25) as it performs the same function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same result as the corresponding element in applicant's specification. See MPEP 2183.

the second server includes point consuming means for updating the point information stored in the second database in association with the user identifying information related to the user so as to consume the point of the user when the second service is provided to the user (column 6, lines 35-37). This limitation meets the three-prong test per MPEP 2181 and thereby invokes 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph. The point offering means of Postrel are considered an equivalent to applicant's means (page 18, lines 19-25) as it performs the same function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same result as the corresponding element in applicant's specification. See MPEP 2183.

the network service system further comprises point transferring means for updating the point information stored in the second database in association with the user identifying information related to the user in the second server based on the point information stored in the first database in association with the user identifying information related to the user in the first server (column 6, lines 20-37). This limitation meets the three-prong test per MPEP 2181 and thereby invokes 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph. The point transferring means of Postrel are considered an equivalent to applicant's means (page 15, line 18 to page 16, line 8) as it performs the same function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same result as the corresponding element in applicant's specification. See MPEP 2183.

However, Postrel is silent on said second server providing the second service directly to a user, as it communicates with the central server. Martinez teaches a system that provides services to users via a server (figure 1, 20). Said server may comprise a plurality of servers (column 3, lines 8-16). Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize multiple servers to provide services directly to users as taught by Martinez, as it is a well known design choice to provide multiple servers, due to the fact that a single server has a limited capacity for bandwidth, and eventually will be filled to capacity, which is easily rectified with the addition of extra servers.

5.   In re claim 2, Postrel discloses a service to allow a user to play a game (column 11, lines 41-44).

6.   Claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Postrel in view of Martinez et al as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view

of Freishtat (US 6,567,850).

7.   In re claim 3, Postrel has been discussed above, but does not disclose a charge

amount calculating means for calculating an amount of money to be paid from a person

involved in the first server to a person involved in the second server. This limitation

meets the three-prong test per MPEP 2181 and thereby invokes 35 U.S.C. 112 6th

paragraph.

        Freishtat teaches a transaction model in which charges are calculated per

transaction, the fees being directed towards the administrator providing the service to

the end user (column 14, lines 21-33). The per transaction of Freishtat is considered an

equivalent to applicant's means (page 19, line 20 to page 20, line 6) as it performs the

same function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same result

as the corresponding element in applicant's specification. See MPEP 2183. It would

have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to

combine the elements of Freishtat with Postrel in order to both generate revenue and to

cover bandwidth costs, and further to fully compensate the administrator for services

provided.

8.   In re claim 4, Postrel has been discussed above, but does not disclose a means

for counting the number of users, and calculating the amount to charge based on the

number of users. This limitation meets the three-prong test per MPEP 2181 and

thereby invokes 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph.

Freishtat teaches a transaction model which allows for the calculation of per user

fees (column 14, lines 21-33), further disclosing it as a way to debit an account based

on the number of users (claim 10 of the reference). The per user transaction of

Freishtat is considered an equivalent to applicant's means (page 19, line 20 to page 20,

line 6) as it performs the same function in substantially the same way and produces

substantially the same result as the corresponding element in applicant's specification.

See MPEP 2183. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the per user transactions of Freishtat with Postrel for

the predictable result of generating revenue and to cover bandwidth costs, and further

to fully compensate the administrator for services provided.

9.   In re claims 5 and 6, while Postrel, Martinez and Freishtat do not explicitly

disclose the charge amount calculating means described, they are merely obvious

design choices. Freishtat has already described one charge amount calculating means.

The use of other, varied charge amount calculating means are simply a matter of

preference of the owner of the service, as the end result remains a predictable result of

charging users for using a service.

10.   Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Postrel in view of Martinez as applied to claims 1-2 above, and in further view of Atalla

(US 4,268,715) and Durst, JR et al (US 2001/0032252 A1).

11.   In re claim 7, Postrel discloses:

point inquiry request receiving means for receiving a point inquiry request

(column 6, lines 7-11 and column 11, line 66 to column 12, line 1). This limitation meets the three-prong test per MPEP 2181 and thereby invokes 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph. In order for the account information to be obtained, the user logs in and requests said information through the web browser and by entering the appropriate information. The point inquiry means of Postrel are considered an equivalent to applicant's means (page 19, lines 2-7) as it performs the same function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same result as the corresponding element in applicant's specification. See MPEP 2183.

point transferring request receiving means for receiving a point transfer request (column 6, lines 20-37). This limitation meets the three-prong test per MPEP 2181 and thereby invokes 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph. The point transferring means of Postrel are considered an equivalent to applicant's means (page 15, line 18 to page 16, line 8) as it performs the same function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same result as the corresponding element in applicant's specification. See MPEP 2183.

point information returning means for returning the point information stored in the first database when the point inquiry request is received by the point inquiry request receiving means (column 6, lines 25-30). This limitation meets the three-prong test per MPEP 2181 and thereby invokes 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph. The point information returning means of Postrel are considered an equivalent to applicant's means (page 15, line 18 to page 16, line 8) as it performs the same function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same result as the corresponding element in

applicant's specification. See MPEP 2183.

However, Postrel does not disclose:

secret identification information updating means for updating secret identification information stored in the first database in association with the point information when the point information stored in the first database is updated by the point information updating means;

secret identification information returning means;

the point transfer request receiving means including secret identification information;

first point transferring means for updating the point information stored in the first database to decrease a point balance and returning point transfer allowance data when the secret identification information included in the point transfer request received by the point transfer request receiving means matches the secret identification information stored in the first database; and

second point transferring means for updating the point information stored in the second database to increase a point balance when the point transfer allowance data is returned by the first point transferring means. All of the previous limitations meet the three-prong test per MPEP 2181 and thereby invokes 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph.

Atalla teaches:

secret identification information updating means (column 3, lines 45-48). The means of Atalla is considered an equivalent to applicant's means (page 21, line 24 to page 22, line 11), as it performs the same function in substantially the same way and

produces substantially the same result as the corresponding element in applicant's specification. See MPEP 2183.

a transaction that occurs only when the secret information (the ID) from one file matches the secret information from the other (column 3, line 54 to column 4, line 7). The verification method of Atalla is considered an equivalent to applicant's means (page 21, line 24 to page 22, line 11) as it performs the same function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same result as the corresponding element in applicant's specification. See MPEP 2183.

providing the secret identification information when requested (column 3, line 54 to column 4, line 7), thus returning the information.

While Atalla and Postrel are silent on returning secret identification information upon receiving a point inquiry request, it is a well known feature in the art to allow for the retrieval of secret identification information upon request by a user. There will be cases in which the user forgets his or her password to an account, and thus, may request for the password to be emailed or otherwise sent to the user as a reminder, as can be seen in Durst (paragraph [0134]). The request being a point inquiry request is merely an obvious design choice, as one skilled in the art could choose to send any sort of information upon the request for secret information, or alternatively, to send secret information in the point inquiry request, without undue experimentation and with predictable results.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the first and second point transferring means with the methods of

Atalla and Durst for the predictable improvement of improving security of data

transmissions between stations by making it unnecessary to transmit user-identification

information between the stations, while making it possible for users to be reminded of

their secret information.

12.   In re claim 8, Postrel discloses a point transfer system including first and second

databases (figure 4, 54 and 52), each storing point information, comprising:

point information updating means for updating the point information stored in the

first database (column 6, lines 47-50). This limitation meets the three-prong test per

MPEP 2181 and thereby invokes 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph. The point offering

means of Postrel are considered an equivalent to applicant's means (page 18, lines 19-

25) as it performs the same function in substantially the same way and produces

substantially the same result as the corresponding element in applicant's specification.

See MPEP 2183.

point inquiry request receiving means for receiving a point inquiry request

(column 6, lines 7-11 and column 11, line 66 to column 12, line 1). This limitation meets

the three-prong test per MPEP 2181 and thereby invokes 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph.

In order for the account information to be obtained, the user logs in and requests said

information through the web browser and by entering the appropriate information. The

point inquiry means of Postrel are considered an equivalent to applicant's means (page

19, lines 2-7) as it performs the same function in substantially the same way and

produces substantially the same result as the corresponding element in applicant's

specification. See MPEP 2183.

point transferring request receiving means for receiving a point transfer request

(column 6, lines 20-37). This limitation meets the three-prong test per MPEP 2181 and

thereby invokes 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph. The point transferring means of Postrel

are considered an equivalent to applicant's means (page 15, line 18 to page 16, line 8)

as it performs the same function in substantially the same way and produces

substantially the same result as the corresponding element in applicant's specification.

See MPEP 2183.

point information returning means for returning the point information stored in the

first database when the point inquiry request is received by the point inquiry request

receiving means (column 6, lines 25-30). This limitation meets the three-prong test per

MPEP 2181 and thereby invokes 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph. The point information

returning means of Postrel are considered an equivalent to applicant's means (page 15,

line 18 to page 16, line 8) as it performs the same function in substantially the same

way and produces substantially the same result as the corresponding element in

applicant's specification. See MPEP 2183.

However, Postrel does not disclose:

secret identification information updating means for updating secret identification

information stored in the first database in association with the point information when

the point information stored in the first database is updated by the point information

updating means;

secret identification information returning means;

the point transfer request receiving means including secret identification

information;

first point transferring means for updating the point information stored in the first

database to decrease a point balance and returning point transfer allowance data when

the secret identification information included in the point transfer request received by the

point transfer request receiving means matches the secret identification information

stored in the first database; and

second point transferring means for updating the point information stored in the

second database to increase a point balance when the point transfer allowance data is

returned by the first point transferring means. All of the previous limitations meet the

three-prong test per MPEP 2181 and thereby invokes 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph.

Atalla teaches:

secret identification information updating means (column 3, lines 45-48). The

means of Atalla is considered an equivalent to applicant's means (page 21, line 24 to

page 22, line 11), as it performs the same function in substantially the same way and

produces substantially the same result as the corresponding element in applicant's

specification. See MPEP 2183.

a transaction that occurs only when the secret information (the ID) from one file

matches the secret information from the other (column 3, line 54 to column 4, line 7).

The verification method of Atalla is considered an equivalent to applicant's means (page

21, line 24 to page 22, line 11) as it performs the same function in substantially the

same way and produces substantially the same result as the corresponding element in

applicant's specification. See MPEP 2183.

providing the secret identification information when requested (column 3, line 54

to column 4, line 7), thus returning the information.

While Atalla and Postrel are silent on returning secret identification information

upon receiving a point inquiry request, it is a well known feature in the art to allow for

the retrieval of secret identification information upon request by a user. There will be

cases in which the user forgets his or her password to an account, and thus, may

request for the password to be emailed or otherwise sent to the user as a reminder, as

can be seen in Durst (paragraph [0134]). The request being a point inquiry request is

merely an obvious design choice, as one skilled in the art could choose to send any sort

of information upon the request for secret information, or alternatively, to send secret

information in the point inquiry request, without undue experimentation and with

predictable results.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was

made to combine the first and second point transferring means with the methods of

Atalla and Durst for the predictable improvement of improving security of data

transmissions between stations by making it unnecessary to transmit user-identification

information between the stations, while making it possible for users to be reminded of

their secret information.

13.   In re claim 9, Atalla teaches the secret identification information updating the

information based on a random number (column 3, line 45 to column 4, line 7).

14.   In re claims 10 and 11, please see rejection for claim 8.

15.   In re claim 12, Postrel discloses a network game system, comprising:

        a first game (column 11, lines 41-44) server (figure 4, 20);

        a first database (figure 4, 54) connected to the first server for storing point

information in association with user identifying information related to the user in the first

server (column 7, lines 14-19 and figure 5, 54, "user accounts," "user preferences,"

etc.). As disclosed, database 54 stores the user's reward exchange account, and

transfer of points into said account is possible (column 7, lines 21-23).

        a second game (column 11, lines 41-44) server (figure 4, 10, 12, or 14); and

        a second database connected to the second server (figure 4, 52 and column 6,

lines 17-20) for storing point information in association with user identifying information

related to the user in the second service (column 5, lines 39-43); wherein

        the first game server includes

        point information updating means for updating the point information stored in the

first database (column 6, lines 47-50). This limitation meets the three-prong test per

MPEP 2181 and thereby invokes 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph. The point information

updating means of Postrel are considered an equivalent to applicant's means (page 18,

lines 19-25) as it performs the same function in substantially the same way and

produces substantially the same result as the corresponding element in applicant's

specification. See MPEP 2183.

        point information returning means for returning the point information stored in the

first database when the point inquiry request is received by the point inquiry request

receiving means (column 6, lines 25-30). This limitation meets the three-prong test per

MPEP 2181 and thereby invokes 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph. The point information

returning means of Postrel are considered an equivalent to applicant's means (page 15,

line 18 to page 16, line 8) as it performs the same function in substantially the same

way and produces substantially the same result as the corresponding element in

applicant's specification. See MPEP 2183.

point inquiry request receiving means for receiving a point inquiry request

(column 6, lines 7-11 and column 11, line 66 to column 12, line 1). This limitation meets

the three-prong test per MPEP 2181 and thereby invokes 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph.

In order for the account information to be obtained, the user logs in and requests said

information through the web browser and by entering the appropriate information. The

point inquiry means of Postrel are considered an equivalent to applicant's means (page

19, lines 2-7) as it performs the same function in substantially the same way and

produces substantially the same result as the corresponding element in applicant's

specification. See MPEP 2183.

However, Postrel does not disclose:

secret identification information updating means for updating secret identification

information stored in the first database in association with the point information when

the point information stored in the first database is updated by the point information

updating means;

secret identification information returning means;

the point transfer request receiving means including secret identification

information;

first point transferring means for updating the point information stored in the first

database to decrease a point balance and returning point transfer allowance data when

the secret identification information included in the point transfer request received by the

point transfer request receiving means matches the secret identification information

stored in the first database; and

the second game server including

second point transferring means for updating the point information stored in the

second database to increase a point balance when the point transfer allowance data is

returned by the first point transferring means. All of the previous limitations meet the

three-prong test per MPEP 2181 and thereby invokes 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph.

Atalla teaches:

secret identification information updating means (column 3, lines 45-48). The

means of Atalla is considered an equivalent to applicant's means (page 21, line 24 to

page 22, line 11), as it performs the same function in substantially the same way and

produces substantially the same result as the corresponding element in applicant's

specification. See MPEP 2183.

a transaction that occurs only when the secret information (the ID) from one file

matches the secret information from the other (column 3, line 54 to column 4, line 7).

The verification method of Atalla is considered an equivalent to applicant's means (page

21, line 24 to page 22, line 11) as it performs the same function in substantially the

same way and produces substantially the same result as the corresponding element in

applicant's specification. See MPEP 2183.

providing the secret identification information when requested (column 3, line 54 to column 4, line 7), thus returning the information.

However, Postrel is silent on said second server providing the second service directly to a user, as it communicates with the central server. Martinez teaches a system that provides services to users via a server (figure 1, 20). Said server may comprise a plurality of servers (column 3, lines 8-16). Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize multiple servers to provide services directly to users as taught by Martinez, as it is a well known design choice to provide multiple servers, due to the fact that a single server has a limited capacity for bandwidth, and eventually will be filled to capacity, which is easily rectified with the addition of extra servers.

While Atalla and Postrel are silent on returning secret identification information upon receiving a point inquiry request, it is a well known feature in the art to allow for the retrieval of secret identification information upon request by a user. There will be cases in which the user forgets his or her password to an account, and thus, may request for the password to be emailed or otherwise sent to the user as a reminder, as can be seen in Durst (paragraph [0134]). The request being a point inquiry request is merely an obvious design choice, as one skilled in the art could choose to send any sort of information upon the request for secret information, or alternatively, to send secret information in the point inquiry request, without undue experimentation and with predictable results.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was

made to combine the first and second point transferring means with the method of Atalla

and Durst for the predictable improvement of improving security of data transmissions

between stations by making it unnecessary to transmit user-identification information

between the stations, while making it possible for users to be reminded of their secret

information.

Response to Arguments

16.   Applicant's arguments filed 1/28/2008 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive. Furthermore, the arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of

rejection. Several arguments will be discussed here regardless.

The recitation that the "services compris[es] activities which allow the user to

earn points by using the service" has not been given patentable weight because it has

been held that a preamble is denied the effect of a limitation where the claim is drawn to

a structure and the portion of the claim following the preamble is a self-contained

description of the structure not depending for completeness upon the introductory

clause. Kropa v. Robie, 88 USPQ 478 (CCPA 1951). Nevertheless, the recitation has

been addressed in the prior art.

Conclusion

17.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN Y. KIM whose telephone number is (571)270-3215. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan Thai can be reached on 571-272-7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kevin Y Kim/
Examiner, Art Unit 3714
/XUAN M. THAI/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714